DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 043 057 CG 005 833

AUTHOR	Khanna, J. L.
TITLE	Human Relations Training for Educators. Final Evaluation. Project Upper Cumberland.
INSTITUTION	Project Upper Cumberland, Livingston, Tenn.
PUB DATE	Jul 70
NOTE	114p.
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF-$0.50 HC-$5.80
DESCRIPTORS	*Educational Disadvantagement, Inservice Teacher Education, *Pilot Projects, Program Descriptions, *Program Evaluation, Teacher Improvement

ABSTRACT

Project Upper Cumberland was a three year endeavor which served 16 Tennessee counties. The final report and evaluation, in three documents, summarizes the three innovative programs which it engendered: (1) teacher inservice training, emphasizing human relations; (2) a pilot cultural arts program (art, music, drama) for grades 1-12; and (3) a pilot guidance and counseling program for grades 1-9. This portion of the report focuses on human relations training. All three report areas have as a general goal the changing and improving of attitudes. The sample, control group, design and procedure of the inservice program, as well as its shortcomings and achievements, are fully elaborated according to the Title III ESEA evaluation format. Positive results are noted in the fact that the inservice program has already been implemented. Overall it was felt that the greatest contribution to the project has been the introduction of the Title III ESEA concept to the region, thereby laying the groundwork for future programs which hopefully will attack the needs of the region with greater accuracy. The research reported herein was funded under Title III of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. (TL)

EDO 43057

FINAL EVALUATION

Title III ESEA Program

in

Human Relations Training for Educators

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Sponsored By

Project Upper Cumberland

1967-70

DG 005 833

ED043057

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to express my sincere appreciation to the following:

Mr. Douglas Norman, Project Director, Title III, ESEA, Overton County Board of Education for his valuable advice and guidance in the overall administration of this research program, and for his painstaking efforts to get the subjects for the study;

Dr. O. C. Stewart, Dean, Tennessee Technological University, Cookeville, for his help in interviewing and for his suggestions for sample selection and his practical and judicious advice and encouragement all along this study;

Mr. Harold Williams, Coordinator, Title III, ESEA, Overton County Board of Education, for his providing facilities for interviewing and for his advice in the budgetary matters;

Mrs. Murial Davis of the Comprehensive Care Center, Lexington, Kentucky, for her help in interviewing;

Mr. Eldon Taylor and Miss Sue Brown for their help in analysis of data;

Mrs. Regina Hall and Mrs. Rosalind Griffin for their painstaking help and patience in typing several versions of this manuscript;

And last but not the least to my wife Dr. Prabha Khanna for her constant encouragements and substantial professional help in the planning, execution and writing stages of this research program.

July, 1970 J. L. Khanna

CONTENTS

		PAGE
1.	Introduction	1
	PART I	
2.	Description of the Sample	4
3.	Design and Procedure	9
4.	Interview Analysis	13
5.	Analysis of the Questionnaire Completed by Supervisors	43
6.	Fleishman's Leadership Questionnaire	53
7.	Analysis of the Feedback Questionnaire	56
	PART II	
8.	Final Evaluation	78
9.	Bibliography	101
10.	Appendix A	105
11.	Appendix B	112

INTRODUCTION

This is a report on the evaluation of the Human Relations training program for the year 1969-70. This report will endeavor (pp. 78 – 100) to evaluate this Title III program in terms of Phase IV of the guidelines of the State of Tennessee evaluation procedures for Title III programs (3 , p. 37). Phase IV of the guidelines is described in the following words:

> Final evaluation, the fourth phase in the model, provides for evaluating the effectiveness of the total project or program by comparing its results with the needs it was designed to fulfill and the objectives which were to be met by the program. In the foregoing section on Operational Evaluation the focus was on individual, component parts or stages of a project or program. By contrast, Final Evaluation focuses on the entire scope of the project and the determination of its success, or lack of success, in meeting the objectives specified and in satisfying the needs toward which it was directed.

An effort will also be made to critically evaluate the contributions of this program in terms of its positive contributions and drawbacks. It is necessary that this report should be read in conjunction with the Human Relations Training evaluation report of 1968-69 as cross-references will be made to this report in the present write up. For ready reference a copy of 1968-69 report is enclosed in Appendix B.

The present report will be divided into two parts. Part I will deal with the evaluation of the program during 1969-70 year. Part II will deal with the Phase IV and the critical evaluation mentioned above.

Part I will describe:

A. The nature of the sample.

B. Design and procedure.

C. The instruments used and the results obtained.

D. Implication of the results.

E. Summary and conclusions.

Relevant statistical tables are included in the report, for those readers who might be interested in these. Detailed statistical analyses are available from the writer on request.

PART I

DESCRIPTION OF THE SAMPLE

Before the actual description of the sample, some characteristics of the region from which this sample was selected will be described. While discussing this region, Norman (21, pp. 4-6) says,

> Until very recently, commerce and industry found the geography of the upper Cumberlands too difficult to deal with and by-passed the region, leaving it in semi-isolation. The upper reaches of the Cumberland river were too shallow for tugs and barges. Major highway into the region was U.S. 70 North, two lane black-topped road which almost doubled back on itself as it snaked along the ridges from east to west. A short line railroad, the Tennessee Central, served the upper Cumberlands until 1968, when it was forced to declare bankruptcy and was absorbed by three connecting lines. North-South travel was entirely dependent upon secondary roads, even more crooked and discouraging than the east-west route.
>
> Although there were some good times, relatively speaking, the region's natural resources were steadily depleted during the first half of the 20th century.
>
> The last boom came during the second World War; after that, the coal industry was forced to automate and meet the increasing competition from other forms of industry. The small mines of Appalachia, including those of the Upper Cumberlands became unprofitable and were closed by operators without much talk about what would become of the miners. Sometimes miners would report to work on Monday morning only to find closed notices tacked on mine tipples. One mine closed for its annual vacation period and then when workers returned after spending their vacation pay, presented them with a notice that the mine would no longer operate.
>
> Federal efforts to aid the poor of Appalachia formerly known as "War on Poverty Program" in the upper Cumberlands have been well intended and burdened with uncertain finances, brought on by the Vietnam War and changing bureaucratic philosophies. Soon after the act of Great Society legislation was passed in 1965, this country became involved in wide scale warfare in Vietnam and civil disturbances in urban ghettos. Concern about national ills focused on the cities. There was a tremendous outpouring of coverage of ghetto problems in the mass media. Contrasted to attention generated by urban pressure groups and militant organizations, the people of Appalachia seemed passive and scattered. National preoccupation with the cities was such

> that national planners overlooked the rural beginnings of many city problems. Or, if they recognized them, there was much urgency in the multitude of afflictions of cities like New York that the rural small town south seemed far away and was pushed further down the list of national priorities.

This region which is called Upper Cumberland Region in Tennessee comprises one-eighth of the total land area in Tennessee. This area lost nearly ten per cent of its population between 1950 and 1960, but since 1960 the trend has reversed and the region is now gaining in population due primarily to industrial, federal funds and general economic stimulation. But even as late as 1965, one-half of the households had an effective buying power of less than $2500.00. For every $100.00 that the average person in the United States had to spend, the average Upper Cumberland resident had only $49.00.

The average educational level for adults 25 years of age and over in the Upper Cumberland area is mid-seventh grade for men and approximately eighth grade for women. If each person with less than five years of schooling is classified as a functional illiterate, almost one-fourth of the adult population would fall into this classification.

Some students must ride a school bus three hours or more daily to attend school that does not provide the type of curriculum needed to prepare them to live in the last third of the twentieth century. Of the 25 high schools in the Upper Cumberland Region, 18 have enrollments of less than 500 students. Thirteen of these 25 schools offer 30 courses or fewer. Five of the school systems have enrollments of less than 2000 students. Approximately 100 schools have a four-teacher capacity or less. One-fourth of the teachers have less than a bachelor's degree.

Art, music, drama, guidance and effective programs in vocational education are almost non-existent. The number of persons per hospital bed, the number of persons for each physician and the number of persons for each dentist in the area is more than twice as large as the same ratio for the State of Tennessee

Stewart (28) has raised a basic question by saying "How do you improve education in such a region? We could all give many answers but one main ingredient which has to be considered is the classroom teacher. We could build fine buildings, provide elaborate equipment, increase expenditures and do just about anything else we wish, but the only thing that really makes the difference is the teacher. Our salaries are too low. We know that by and large we are stuck with the teachers we have and they with us." So, the argument was made that we must improve the teachers we have.

The sample consisted of 71 educators. These educators had participated in the Human Relations Training program either during 1968 or during 1969. Selection of the sample was made by the staff who had worked during the past two years with these participants. The staff was assisted by the advice of the Director and Co-director of the project.

The guiding principle of the selection was to make an effort to choose (on the basis of clinical judgements) those persons who had shown potentialities of being successful change agents in the opinion of the staff. It was not intended that the participants would become trainers after this experience, but it was hoped that perhaps they could work as co-trainers with leaders from regional universities or with one or two trainers who have formerly been connected with the Upper Cumberland

Program. In this way, it was hoped, that local school systems could afford to incorporate some Human Relations Training into their inservice programs.

This sample consisted of 51% males and 49% females. Their ages ranged from 21 years to 61 years. The mean age was 45.8 years. Sixty-six percent of the participants were married. Their experiences ranged from elementary school to high school, to principal and educational administrators.

Changes in the entire sample were studied by the administration of the feedback questionnaire (pp.107-108) and Fleishman's Leadership Scale (11).

For a more extensive assessment of change, it was not possible to study the entire sample due to budgetary restrictions. This extensive assessment was undertaken by selecting 20 persons from the sample. These 20 persons comprised the experimental group. A comparable control group of 20 persons was also selected. Details about the selection of these experimental and control groups are given below.

The 20 persons who comprised the experimental group were chosen in a random stratified manner from the total number of participants. The strata used in the sample selection were the density of population, the participating counties, the nature of jobs and the kinds of schools from which they came. An effort was made to have an even number of males and females.

In order to select a control group, each participant in the program was asked to nominate two individuals who were similar in terms

of their age, occupation, and number of years of teaching experiences to himself, and who had not participated in the program. Half of the control group consisted of a random sample from these nominations taking care that one person was selected at least for each participant. The other half of the control group was chosen from a school system which had not been exposed to the Human Relations workshop during the three years, the assumption being that these persons would know less about this program than those who had been chosen by the experimental group.

Participants in the control group were paid $10.00 for each interview (described on page 110). During the workshop each participant in the experimental group was paid $15.00 for each day they attended, plus $3.00 a day for each dependent.

A statistical analysis of the ages, income, and the number of dependents of the experimental and control groups indicated that the two groups did not differ from each other significantly.

DESIGN AND PROCEDURE

The nature of the sample, the experimental and the control groups used in this investigation have already been described (pages 4-8).

The exact format of the three week human relations program to which the members of the experimental group were exposed was as under:

1. One week was devoted to a programmed problem solving exercise, namely, RUPS model (13).

2. The second week was devoted to self-examination and planning for the future and the main instrument used in this case was a study of Life Style. An outline of this is given in Appendix A page 109 .

3. The third week was devoted to a discussion of "back home" problems in the school systems and their possible solutions. This involved interpersonal interactions among persons who held similar jobs. This was followed by interactions among different school faculties which in turn were followed by school systems in a county interchanging and discussing problems. Lastly, the different counties made an attempt to arrive at a solution of some of their problems.

This phase of training encouraged the participants to draw on all the skills that they had acquired in the previous two years and the preceding two weeks.

The evaluation consisted of the following steps:

1. Administration of the Fleishman's Leadership Scale (11) at the beginning of the three week workshop and at the end of it to all the participants.
2. Administration of a feedback questionnaire at the end of the three week workshop to the participants. A copy of this questionnaire can be found in Appendix A, pages 107-8. This questionnaire attempted to find out the participants' perceptions in the area of their improvement of skills in problem solving, their feelings about the RUPS model, and the possible applications of the Human Relations Training program to their inservice training programs back home. It also tried to tap their feelings about the Life Plan Program and tried to elicit their ideas about their plans for problem solving in the back home situations.
3. The 20 persons who comprised the control group and the 20 persons who comprised the experimental group (the details of the selection have already been given on pages 7-8) were interviewed by experienced interviewers. The interview outline which was followed can be seen on page 110 of the Appendix A.

These interviews attempted to assess whether or not the interviewees felt that they had functioned differently in their job roles during the past school year as compared to the previous year or whether or not they had done things differently during this period of time.

It also attempted to assess if there were any changes in their

relationships with their superiors. An effort was made to learn more about these changes and their feelings towards their superiors. They were also asked if they related differently or felt differently towards their students and if they had instituted any new activities in their school programs during the past school years. In addition, an effort was made to find out if the teacher's community relationships had been different during the past year. The interview ended by the interviewee being asked to describe what were the experiences that changed him most in his life.

The interview took anywhere from 45 minutes to one hour and extensive nondirective probing was used by the interviewers to elicit the maximum possible information. Due to unavoidable circumstances (e.g., failure of the tape recorders to record the interviews, persons showing up for interviews who could not be considered as adequate study subjects in the light of the criteria of sample selection) only 19 interviews in the experimental group and 18 interviews in the control group were used in this study.

The interview data were content analyzed and appropriate statistical tests run. The findings on the basis of these are discussed later on pages .

4. The persons comprising the experimental and control groups were given a questionnaire with a request that it be handed over to their superiors by them for completion. This questionnaire was designed to assess the superior's perception of changes in the experimental and control groups. A copy of the question contained in this

questionnaire can be seen on page 111 of Appendix A. Only nine of the experimental group superiors and twelve of the control group superiors returned this questionnaire after completion.

It should be pointed out again that part of the evaluation, namely, the aspect concerned with the Leadership Scale and the Feedback Questionnaire used the entire sample. While the other part, namely, the interviewing, due to budget limitations, was restricted to a subsample of the participants and a matched control group.

INTERVIEW ANALYSIS

The sample that comprised the experimental and the control groups has already been described in detail earlier on pages 7-8. A copy of the guidelines used for interviewing is contained in the Appendix A, page 110 .

Four interviewers, three of whom had been trainers in the human relations program interviewed the two groups. Interviews were taped then transcribed and content analyzed. All interviews were conducted in an open-ended manner and extensive probing was used to get the maximum possible information.

The interviews brought out a series of developments that had taken place across the state. These changes varied from county to county but did not vary for the two groups. They consisted of such things as changes in jobs within the past two or three years, changes brought about by administrative modifications made in the school systems such as consolidation of schools. It was felt that both groups had been exposed to the same sort of changes and that the changes did not constitute a hardship either in favor of or against a particular group.

Each of the interviews does carry an individual flavor and gives the picture of a person involved with particular types of problems. Only a very rough attempt will be made to make generalized statements and statistically compare groups since such statistical comparisons are not feasible without losing a good deal of the data that is available. The report therefore will content itself in being more descriptive and in attempting to bring out the responses as much as they were elicited by the various interviews.

The first question that was asked of each interviewee was, "How do you feel you have functioned as a teacher in this school year as compared to previous years?" The question had sometimes to be modified because the participants of the experimental group felt that the changes had occurred not during the past year but since their experiences in the training labs. The question was therefore generally modified to mean within the past two or three years rather than a strict chronological year.

A striking difference in the responses of the two groups (experimental and control) with very little overlap was the manner in which the question was interpreted. On the whole the experimental group perceived this question to refer to intrapersonal changes and and talked of changes in their own attitudes, their communication skills and differences in teaching methods that they had employed. The problem may have been partly compounded by the fact that nearly all the interviewers were past trainers of the sensitivity training labs so that when these trainers asked these questions the respondents assumed that they were talking about variables that they had discussed within the training labs.

The control group on the other hand generally tended to refer to changes that had taken place in the external circumstances of their jobs and talked of changes in their job, changes in the school system such as consolidation of schools, etc. A few of these, but a small minority, did refer to the changes as related to their own personalities.

In categorizing the respondents' statements in terms of whether they referred to the personal changes or to the physical changes we find that sixteen of the experimental group spontaneously referred to the personal changes and two to the physical changes whereas five of the controlled referred to personal changes and fourteen to physical changes. The differences are statistically significant at the more than .01 level ($x^2 = 13.80$) (Table I , page 16).

A look at the types of responses will give a flavor of the differences in the groups. The experimental group made such statements as, "The discipline in my room has changed radically. Formerly I would paddle any child who answered me in a sarcastic manner. Now I look for the why, the reason the child is misbehaving. I tell my students that they may express their opinions but they must express them in an acceptable manner." Another one stated, "I feel more comfortable. I have better relations with teachers. I know the difference between respect and fear of authority and I feel more open." Another stated, "I have learned to speak out more. I feel more 'in the group with the others.' I feel more a participant and less an observer." Another one stated, "I feel more receptive to others' suggestions and complaints." Others stated, "I look at other person's side of problems more," or "I am accepting people even when I can't accept ideas," or "I feel more aware of feelings of others."

Additional responses were such as, "I have realized a limitation within myself. That is, I am not emotionally geared for working with special types of children." Or, "I place greater emphasis on involving the whole group." Or, "I permit class discussions to stray from subject matter occasionally."

Table 1

Q. 1. Functioning as a Teacher

Nature of Change	Experimental Group	Control Group	Total
Personal Change (including teaching methods)	16	5	21
Physical Change (New job, external circumstances, work load)	2	14	16
Total	18	19	37

$x^2 = 13.80$ $p < .001$*

Some of the participants had tried to apply procedures they had learned in the training labs. Some of them said for instance that they had tried role playing in their classes or that they had allowed subordinate teachers below them to share responsibility of presiding over faculty meetings. One of the principals stated that he now involves teachers and parents to get the work done rather than taking sole responsibility for everything. Another stated that he likes to find out why a student is indifferent and used this information in compiling tests in order to get these students actively involved. Another stated that she takes initiative in finding ways to improve a child's emotional and intellectual situation.

Generally speaking the experimental group was clearly aware of their interpersonal relationships and felt that they had changed and that their function as a teacher was due to the change within themselves rather than to other changes. This is not to say that they were not aware at all of the physical changes. For instance, some of them mentioned that they had a new job or that they now taught a different type of a class than they used to or that they were now a sole teacher in a school where they had been used to being part of a team or that they had a different type of a job all together. However, as stated above the predominance of the topics mentioned referred to the interpersonal relationships with emphasis on the change having been brought about because of intrapersonal changes.

As opposed to this the control group was not that preoccupied with or that aware of their own role. With the exception of five people who referred to their personal involvement sometimes in positive and

sometimes in negative ways the majority of the group referred to the changes that had taken place in the total school structure. Their responses ranged from, "There is more apparent cooperation," to, "I have a new job, it's a different type of a job," "The curriculum is more strenuous and I have felt it necessary to teach several classes which makes me feel not completely involved in any job," or "This is my first year at a new type of school and I am teaching more academic subjects than I used to," or "We are now trying out a new method, the phonetic method, and I feel that I am not covering as much material as in previous years." There was a sprinkling of a certain amount of a sense of frustration in these adjustments to be made and there were references to such things as the teaching load being heavier, classes being larger, equipment being scarce, and more overcrowding in schools.

A few of the control group referred to changes within themselves but as mentioned above there were only five of the control group who made such statements. Some of these statements were positive. For example, one respondent said that he felt more confident in himself, he had better insight and overall had learned to cope better though he could not pinpoint the reasons. Another respondent said that she felt "more relaxed in the classroom." "I talk more to my students to discover their problems." A third one stated that he saw his role as a superintendent differently. He felt that he represented the teachers and the students more and the board of education less. A few of them were dissatisfied with what was happening. One of them felt strongly that her work had deteriorated compared to other years and another one was concerned about "dispelling my image as an angry and sour teacher." "I am trying to control my temper more."

Since there is no reason to assume that the experimental group had fewer problems to tackle with as regards the changes in job structure or in the job itself or in the school structure, it is interesting to see the differences between the two. The experimental group is very much aware of themselves and of their own change bringing about changes in things around them. They see the functioning as a teacher having differed not because of the external changes that have taken place in their life but because of the change that they have experienced within themselves. They therefore become a source of change themselves.

The second question became a little more specific and asked if they had done anything differently as a teacher in the school year (or the past two years) as compared to prior years. At a general level we find that both the groups did things differently. It seems that there had been changes in their functions as a rule.

Only one of the experimental group and only three out of the control stated that there had been no change. These differences in terms of change or no change across the two groups are not statistically significant (Table 2 , page 30).

Looking at the types of answers they gave, one finds the persistence of the earlier theme, that is, the experimental group tended more to talk about interpersonal relationships and how they could modify these as opposed to the control group which, to some extent, tended to concentrate more on changes residing as outside themselves. There is a certain degree of overlap here but the dominant themes still seem to be different. The experimental group said such things as that

Table 2

Q. 2. "Done differently" as a Teacher

	Experimental Group	Control Group	Total
Yes	17	16	33
No	1	3	4
Total	18	19	37

$x^2 = 1.80$ $p < .50$

they "try to see the students' side more." One respondent gave a specific example of the change in discipline. He said that a child who had stolen five dollars was told by him that if the child returned the money he would not be paddled, something that he would not have done in previous years. Another respondent mentioned the case of a student who she felt was not doing up to par. The teacher went out of the way to talk to the girl and to do things for her to show her that she was wanted and was liked. In both instances the respondents felt that they would not have been this aware of seeking different ways of handling children's problems.

Other members of the experimental group stated that they took special interest in problem students, that they asked students how students feel about things, that they went out of their way to communicate with those that they deal with and try and get all of them involved in the activities rather than a few. They felt that they were more expressive, that they had allowed the students to join in planning their classes, that they had let the students express themselves more, that they had asked the parents to encourage them, that they had listened more to find out what the students liked and how they felt about the instructor. One of the respondents said that she was jotting down ideas about how to help teachers have a better classroom experience. She added that she felt that she now confronts problems rather than avoids them and that she offers her own ideas with less anxiety than she used to.

A few of them referred to the specific changes that had taken place in their surroundings, for example, one mentioned that she was now

teaching all eight grades whereas she only used to teach a few grades in previous years. Some stated that they had started with "modern math" and had more instrumental facilities in the classroom than they used to. One or two had even tried sensitivity training techniques with their colleagues.

As opposed to the experimental group, the control group mentioned such things as using new work books in the courses they teach or, "I let students work more on their own and give longer lectures. Both of these changes are due to the fact that the students I am working with this year are more mature than those of last year." A third one said that she is working with the whole class and then dividing them into small groups or "that she was very involved with the new phonetic techniques being used." One person mentioned that he was handling students differently and was being more sympathetic towards the students as individuals. Some mentioned a change of subject matter or the type of work that they used. One person had sent a survey to parents concerning children's reaction to the kindergarten to better understand the school or that they had worked especially hard to change some of the programs. Generally speaking, it seems that the control group teacher does not see himself as the change agent as much as the experimental group does.

The next question (Question 3) referred to the respondent's realtionship with other teachers or colleagues. Here again we get rather striking differences in the two groups.

The experimental group talked in terms of greater awareness of others, of better communication with others, of greater acceptance

of others, and of being more open to others. None of them felt that there had been any negative interaction with other teachers or colleagues. In contrast to this, the control group predominantly (14 out of 19) stated that there had been no change in their relationships with their colleagues. Three of the controls had some negative statements about their relationships and one had some positive statements. Categorizing the responses in terms of emphasis on awareness, openness, or communicatinn as opposed to no change and a negative change across the two groups, we get a statistically significant difference (chi-square 31.20 significant beyond the .001 level) (Table 3 , page 24).

A look at the type of responses given by the two groups show that the experimental group tends to talk about such things as, "I'm more conscious of the complexity of things," "I place greater emphasis in working together and therefore am more cooperative," "I try to see how others feel," "I try to hear the problems more," "I'm more sensitive to others' problems," "I'm more aware of teachers' feelings and talents through communication," "Association with other teachers has helped me more than anything else," "I do less prejudging of a problem and am more accepting of a problem," "I feel more a part and they seem closer to me. I feel I can talk to them more," "I do not feel as shy and speak out more in inter-relationships," "I make a conscious effort to be tolerant of others' views if they are different from mine."

The control group, on the other hand, predominantly felt that there had been no change in their relationships. It seems that in this context the socially desirable response as seen by the control group was one of no change with implications of that connoting steadfastness

Table 3

Q. 3. Related Differently to Other Teachers or Peers

	Experimental Group	Control Group	Total
Changed in a positive manner	17	1	18
Changed in a negative manner	0	3	3
No change	0	14	14
No reply	1	1	2
Total	18	19	37

$x^2 = 31.20$ $p < .001$*

and loyalty. As mentioned above, one person mentioned that the change had been in a positive direction. She stated that she now had more meaningful relationships with the other teachers. This respondent attributed this change to an inservice program. The three negative responses consisted of such things as the respondent feeling that the other teachers were not working as hard as she was or that there was not as much "cooperation as there used to be" or "there is less contact between the teachers than there used to be."

Question four specifically asked about any change in activities within these relationships with other teacher or peers. A look at Table 4 indicates that ten out of the control and five out of the experimental group felt that there had been no change in activities. Twelve, that is a majority of the experimental group, felt that the change had been of a positive nature. None of the control groups felt that the activities had changed in a positive direction. One each in both the groups felt that the change had been in a negative direction and one out of the experimental and three out of the control felt that the changes could be attributed to new jobs. Lastly, one out of the experimental and four out of the control did not refer to this topic. Statistically speaking, we find that the differences between the two groups are significant at the .01 level (chi square 19.21).

A look at Table 4 shows that the greatest amount of variance occurs in the perception of change or no change and the change being positive (rows 1 and 2). The specific responses given by the participants, reveal that the experimental group referred to such things as better communication, better involvement with others in similar activities,

Table 4

Q. 4. Activities Differed in Relation to Teachers or Peers

	Experimental Group	Control Group	Total
Changed in a positive direction	12	0	12
Changed in a negative direction	0	2	2
No change	5	10	15
New job	0	3	4
No response	1	4	5
Total	18	19	37

$x^2 = 19.21$ $p < .001$*

better participation, etc. Some of the examples of types of responses in this connection were, "I gave advice to a new teacher upon request which I would not have done before," or "I gave a program on sensitivity training that got the teachers involved," or "Tried unsuccessfully to start a sensitivity training group but am trying to change meetings to make them more interesting and am trying to gain more political power for the teachers." Some others stated that they were trying to encourage teachers to actively participate in faculty meetings by allowing them to share the task of presiding over meetings. Some others still felt that they were trying to work as a team on similar problems or "work more closely with peers."

Three out of the control group felt that the change had been towards a negative direction. Their responses consisted of such things as "I don't associate with the teachers because they are catty," or "There is a lack of trust and not as much interaction as there used to be, I do not feel at ease," or "Relationships have gotten bad because of the political split." Three of the control group felt that new jobs had brought about changes which had led to different types of activities with these peers. They mentioned changes in the structure of their roles which had led to more or less contact with their peers.

The next two questions dealt with the respondents' relationships with their superiors and any particular kinds of activities that had changed in this context. Question five dealt with their relationship with their superiors and question six with their particular activities. The group differences are not so pronounced in these cases

as they have been in the variables dealt above. The groups did not show any particular change in their relationships with their superiors (Table 5, page 29). Five out of the experimental group and six out of the control felt that there had been no change. Eleven out of the experimental and nine out of the control felt that the change had been a positive one. The remaining members of the two groups felt that the change had either been a negative one or had not really occurred in such a way as to be assessed because of the change in the job.

It may be interesting to see in what manner the two groups talk about the positive relationship with their superiors. The experimental tends to talk more about better communication with their superior, feel that they are more accepting of their relationship or a combination of the two. Some of the respondents stated that they felt freer to express their opinion, they felt less inferior and felt more confident in their relationships, some felt that they had been of more help to their principal, or felt closer to the principal especially the ones who had had sensitivity training.

The control group when talking of their positive relationships talk about feeling closer to the superintendent. The control group mentioned such things as being able to see the superintendent more because of the new job or that they felt closer to the superintendent because of the political situation within the board of education. Some of the negative comments made by the group were that they felt that in one case the superior had neglected the job because of political differences and another that the size of the faculty of the school

Table 5

Q. 5. Relation with Superiors

	Experimental Group	Control Group	Total
Changed in a positive direction	11	9	20
Changed in a negative direction	1	3	4
No change	5	6	11
New job	1	1	1
Total	18	19	37

$x^2 = 4.08$ $p < .30$

had made it harder to see the principal comparatively speaking or that the new principal was not a very good communicator.

Question number six dealt with any differences in the school activities involving the superiors as such. Here again there are no striking differences between the groups (Table 6 , page 31). Four out of the experimental and seven out of the control group felt that there had been no differences in activities. Eight of the experimental group and three out of the control group felt that there had been new activities which they regarded in a positive manner. Some of the participants mentioned a change in attitude towards a positive direction but the total differences here, though more marked than in the question five, were not statistically significant ($x^2=9.18$, $p<.10$).

Questions seven and eight dealt with the relationship of the respondent with students or their subordinates. It dealt with their relationships with the students or their subordinates if the respondent happened to be a principal or a board of education member. In this case the differences between the groups were again not marked and did not approach statistical significance (Table 7 , page 32). Two out of the experimental group and six out of the control group felt that their relationships with the students had not changed in the immediate past. Fifteen out of the experimental group and eleven out of the control mentioned specific relationships with the students and felt that these had changed for the better. Two out of the control group and none out of the experimental group felt that their relationships with the students had deteriorated.

Some of the examples of the types of responses given by the

Table 6

Q. 6. Activities in Relationship with Superiors

	Experimental Group	Control Group	Total
Changed in a positive direction	8	3	11
Changed in a negative direction	0	3	3
Changed in job structure hence no comparison possible	2	5	7
Change in attitude (positive)	4	1	5
No change	4	7	11
Total	18	19	37

$x^2 = 9.18$ $p < .10$

Table 7

Q. 7. Relationship with Students or Subordinates

	Experimental Group	Control Group	Total
Changed in a positive direction	15	11	26
Changed in a negative direction	0	2	2
No change	2	6	8
No response	1	0	1
Total	18	19	37

$x^2 = 5.65$ $p < .20$

experimental group concerned chiefly with sensitivity, more openness and acceptance. For example, some said that they listened to the students more than they used to in trying to find out how they felt. Others stated that they listened to their teachers if these happened to be their subordinates for ideas and suggestions which they had not previously done and that they were more considerate of the subordinate's feelings. Some of them also felt that they had made fewer snap-judgments and listened to the different points of view, they trusted others more and felt more confidence in their ability to better communicate than they had previously been able to do. There seemed to be, particularly for the experimental group, a certain amount of redundancy in the answer to this question and to question number one. Question number one had to a great extent dealt with these same kinds of matters though there the respondents had spontaneously interpreted the question to involve relationships with the students.

The control group mentioned such things as that they were being better accepted by the subordinates or that some of the particular political situations had became more conducive to better relationships or that they felt closer to the students or that they felt more responsible for the students or that they found the subordinates more friendly. The respondents in the control group who felt that the relationships had deteriorated felt that they had trouble getting through to the students, found that there was an increase in cheating and that there was a lack of interest on the students' part. Another respondent felt that he could not get as close to the students because of the changes in the school structure chiefly the greater enrollment

in the schools and the larger school group as such and missed the close contact that he had had in previous years.

Question eight dealt with any activities related to students that had been changed in these years. Here again we find that the groups seem to be somewhat different. The chief area of difference appears to be what we have termed self-initiated activities, that is, activities that were instituted by the teacher or the superior in question. Table 8 , page 35 shows that two of the experimental and eight of the control felt that there had been no change in activities. Compared to this thirteen out of the experimental mentioned specific activities that they themselves had initiated and four out of the control mentioned such activities. Some of the members of the group mentioned such things as using specific techniques in establishing more interaction with the students. They let the students take part in planning and trying to find out what the students' interests were. They also felt that they were more active in involving the student towards independent thought or dealing with the students in a more informal situations. One or two of the respondents described specific incidents where they had tried to use special games that the student could use in classwork in order to get him more involved and be a more active participant. Some felt that they were now more realistic in their dealings with problem children and that they could encourage their subordinates to work towards their problems more adequately than they used to.

The small number of the control group who mentioned particular activities that they had instituted explained that these took the form of greater emphasis on participation and less on tests or giving students

Table 8

Q. 8. Activities in Dealing with Subordinates

	Experimental Group	Control Group	Total
Self-initiated changes	13	4	17
Externally initiated changes	3	7	10
No change	2	8	10
Total	18	19	37

$x^2 = 10.14$ $p < .01$*

more work to do, or more involvement of subordinates in the meetings that took place or they themselves felt more involved in the activities that they had. A greater number of the control mentioned the change in the job as such and the changes in the activities that the job had brought because of the newness of the job or the changes in the school structure. These were regarded as externally instituted changes. The differences between these two groups along these dimensions are statistically significant at greater than .01 level ($x^2 = 10.14$) (Table 8 , page 35).

When we mention here kinds of activities there seems to be a difference in the language used by the two groups. The experimental group tends to talk about more participation, more acceptance, more involvement, more problem solving and the control group talks more on a level of how they can relate to other people. It is as if the experimental group has acquired a new set of language which they are now using in their classroom situations. To what extent the language communicates and conveys the specific nature of the activities and to what extent these activities are in fact different is difficult to judge.

The last two questions, questions nine and ten, dealt with their relationships with their community. Question nine asked if the respondent felt that he had related differently to the community during the past two or three years as compared to previous years. Question ten dealt with any activities that they had involved themselves in with regard to their communities. Here the differences between the nature of the interviews (discussed separately, see page 88) come a little

more pronounced because several of the respondents did not talk about the relationship with their communities. Seven out of the experimental and three out of the control did not refer to any community relationships and presumably the interviewer in this case did not specifically ask for these areas.

Apart from this we find (Table 9 , page 38) that seven of the experimental and three of the control group related different relationships in various groups. Four out of the experimental and ten out of the control felt that there had been no difference in their relationships within the community as such. The group differences are significant statistically at more than .05 level ($x^2 = 8.72$).

Examining the responses as such we find that the experimental group felt that they had joined many more groups, they were more active than they used to be, or that they had better relationships with the PTA, or that they tried to talk with the parents more, or that they had tried to mix with the people more and find out how they felt. One respondent felt that he had done less in the community than he used to.

In the control group we find that the respondents mentioned such things as spending more time in working in the PTA or the chruches. A few felt that they were doing less in the community than they used to and that the community had enlarged and it was not possible for them to be as actively involved as they used to.

The last question, number ten dealt with the activities within the community that had been different. Here again we find that the differences between the two groups are not statistically significant (Table 10, page 39). Four out of the experimental and ten out of the control felt

Table 9

Q. 9. Relationships with the Community

	Experimental Group	Control Group	Total
Better relationships	7	3	10
Worse relationships	0	3	3
No change	4	10	14
No response	7	3	10
Total	18	19	37

$x^2 = 8.78$ $p < .05$*

Table 10

Q. 10. Activities with Relationship to Community

	Experimental Group	Control Group	Total
More activities	11	4	15
Fewer activities	2	3	5
No change	4	10	14
No response	1	2	3
Total	18	19	37

$x^2 = 6.48$ $p < .10$

that there had been no change in their activities. Eleven out of the experimental and four out of the control felt that there had been greater degree of activity in the community. Two out of the experimental and three out of the control felt that they had become less active within the community.

Examining the responses we find that the experimental group mentioned such things as visiting the community and taking more part in the local politics. A few of the experimental group mentioned introducing sensitivity training in the church, that people had become interested in sensitivity training or that they had better and closer relationships with the local county officials than they used to.

The control group in this connection mentioned such things as trying to contact more parents than they used to or generally participating more than they used to. Two of the control group felt that they were doing less, one because of illness in the past and the other that he just did not see as many parents as he used to in the past.

One of the questions asked not by all of the interviewers but by some of them was how much change the respondents felt within themselves in the past two or three years, the three years being the period when they were involved in the sensitivity training groups. It was an attempt to gauge the extent of the change that the respondents, particularly the experimental group, regarded as obvious, especially with reference to other landmarks in their life that they would regard as responsible for intrapersonal change. No quantitative analysis can be made of this answer because apparently the question was asked

in different ways by different interviewers. However, it seems that a great majority of the experimental group felt that the greatest amount of change within them had come due to the sensitivity training. Some of them mentioned other events in their life but it may safely be said that at least half of them felt that the greatest amount of change had occurred during these past three years. As opposed to this the control group mentioned several events in the course of their life not concentrated in the same period of time. They mentioned such events as a time when they had taken a new course or had been sick or had been to college or had been to the Army or there had been a death in the family or that they had been told some unpleasant things by others around them.

In summary then it appears that the two groups did react differently and do perceive the changes within themselves as being different. One of the global effect in examining through the interviews is that the experimental group has as it were acquired a new "culture." This culture constitutes of such things as talking about communication, accepting each other, greater participation, problem solving. They were also very much apparently aware of the fact that they were being interviewed by the trainers who had been instrumental in propogating such a "culture." It is a matter of speculation whether they would have given the same type of answer if they had not been questioned by the same trainers. The control group apparently has not acquired such a vocabulary and tends to express generally more negative attitudes than the experimental group does. One is impressed by the predominance of positive phrases from the experimental group. It almost

seems that the experimental group does not talk about the problems that must arise in their daily living and does not seem as aware of obstacles that they face. One of the chief differences in the obstacles when they do talk about them is that the experimental group tends to feel that they have changed and therefore have a different approach to the same problems whereas the control group tends to see the sources of change as coming from without.

ANALYSIS OF QUESTIONNAIRE COMPLETED BY SUPERVISORS

The method of construction of this questionnaire and the method of administration have already been described on page 11 . A copy of this questionnaire is contained in the Appendix A page 111 .

In the first question regarding changes in functioning from that of previous years eight of the nine experimental group members were reported to be functioning differently, while of the control group only six of the twelve members were reported to be functioning differently. Statistical analysis by the chi square statistic with one degree of freedom (Table 11 , page 44) indicates the change made by the experimental group is statistically significant ($p < .02$). The change made by the control group is not significantly different from what would be expected on the basis of chance factors ($p = .50$). An analysis of the changes made by the experimental group indicates the individuals became more sensitive to others, expressed their opinions more freely, and were better listeners. Included in the category of becoming more sensitive to others were four responses indicating an increased emphasis upon each child as an individual, three responses indicating more understanding, one response indicating increased empathy, and one response indicating increased awareness of the feelings of others. Seven of the experimental group members were reported to more easily express their opinions and six members were reported to be better listeners. Of the six control group members who were reported to have changed, five were reported to have become more professional and only one was reported to have increased sensitivity to others.

The results of the first question suggest that in the opinion of supervisors of participants the human relations training program

Table 11

Functioning Differently

Group	Changed	Unchanged	x^2	p
Experimental Group	8	1	5.44	$p < .02$**
Control Group	6	6	.46	$p = .50$
Total	14	7	3.50	$p < .10$

significantly increased sensitivity in interpersonal situations and improved communication, both self-expression and receptiveness to others. The change made by the control group of becoming more professional seems consistent with additional on the job experience.

In the second question regarding teacher initiated activities seven of the ten experimental group members were reported to have initiated one or more activities, while five of the twelve control group members have initiated activities. Statistical analysis by chi square (Table 12, page 46) indicates while neither was statistically significant the experimental group tended to initiate more activities ($p = .21$) than the control group ($p = .58$).

An analysis of the activities initiated by experimental group members indicates that on the basis of the perception of supervisors four of the members' new activities dealt with instructional programs, in-service training, and curriculum changes. Two experimental group members initiated activity to improve communications among faculty, students, and parents. One experimental group member initiated sensitivity programs in faculty meetings to help the other teachers increase their understanding of their students. The activities initiated by the five control group members dealt with instructional programs, in-service training and curriculum changes.

The results of the second question suggest that in the opinion of supervisors the human relations training program increased teacher initiated activities particularly those designed to improve communications and increase understanding. Three of the experimental group members initiated activities to improve interpersonal relationships

Table 12

Initiate New Activities

Group	Yes	No	x^2	p
Experimental Group	7	3	1.60	p = .21
Control Group	5	7	.33	p = .58
Total	12	10	1.67	p<.20

while none of the control group members initiated this type of activity. Approximately equal proportions of both groups initiated activities dealing with in-service training, instructional programs, and curriculum changes.

The third question ascertains if the teacher has joined or supported any new activities started by others. Eight of the ten experimental group members were reported to have joined and/or supported activities initiated by others, while five of the twelve control group members joined and/or supported activities initiated by others. Statistical analysis by chi square (Table 13, page 48) indicates the experimental group members support of other initiated activities is significant at 5% level of confidence, while the results of the control group members were not significantly different from what would be expected on the basis of chance factors.

Of the experimental group members two joined groups to improve in-service training, three worked on improving instructional programs or curriculum guides, and three tried new instructional programs. Of the five control group members who supported other initiated activities four joined groups to improve instructional methods, three of the five worked on a salary committee, one of the five worked on improving in-service training, and two of the five aided in visits by administrators and parents to their school.

The results of the third question suggests that according to the supervisors' perceptions the human relations training program increases joining and/or support of other initiated activities.

Table 13

Join Other Initiated Activities

Group	Yes	No	x^2	p
Experimental Group	8	2	3.60	p = .05*
Control Group	5	7	.30	p = .58
Total	13	9	3.34	p<.15

The fourth question deals with the teacher's relation to other teachers. Analysis of the results of the experimental group members indicates that nine of the ten members were reported to have above average relationships with other teachers and only one teacher was reported to have only average relationships. Of the thirteen control group members three were reported to have less than average relationships, one with average relationships, and the remaining nine members above average relationships with other teachers. The results are presented in Table 14, page 50.

While a statistical analysis was not significant the results of question four suggest that the human relations training program increased teacher-teacher relations.

The fifth question deals with the teacher's relation to students. The results of the experimental group indicate that all had better than average relationships with their students. Two of the nine members were reported to assist students with personal problems. The results (Table 15, page 51) of the thirteen control group members indicate two members have only satisfactory relationships with their students, nine have better than average relationships, and two members, both administrators, were reported to have the respect of the students but their relationship with students was undeterminable. Two members of the control group were also reported to assist students with personal problems.

Statistical analysis was not significant and differences in teacher-student relationships between the experimental and control groups are slight but do seem to suggest that the human relations training program tends to increase teacher-student relations.

Table 14

Teacher - Teacher Relations

Group	Relationships		
	Below Average	Average	Above Average
Experimental Group	0	1	9
Control Group	3	1	9
Total	3	2	18

Table 15

Teacher - Student Relations

Group	Relationships	
	Average	Above Average
Experimental Group	0	9
Control Group	2	9
Total	2	18

The sixth question requests any additional information that might be pertinent to understanding the role of the teacher being evaluated. Analysis of the results of question six did not yield any additional relevant information.

In summary, it can be said that in the opinion of the teachers and supervisors the human relations training program significantly increased sensitivity in interpersonal relations, expressiveness of opinions, and openness to the opinions of others. The training tended to increase self-initiation of new activities and increased joining and/or support of other initiated new activities both of which suggest increased concern for improvement or at least increased communication of concern for improvement and an openness to new ideas and new techniques. The training also tended to improve teacher-teacher and teacher-student relations.

FLEISHMAN'S LEADERSHIP OPINION QUESTIONNAIRE

In an attempt to assess the results of the three weeks program (pp. 9), the participants were administered the Leadership Opinion Questionnaire by Edward A. Fleishman (11). This questionnaire was administered at the beginning of the workshop and again at the end of the workshop.

The Leadership Opinion Questionnaire provides measures of two dimensions of supervisory leadership. The first measure, called consideration, provides some measure of the amount of trust, respect, and warmth between the supervisor and his subordinates. The second measure is called structure and is intended to reflect the extent to which the individual is likely to define and structure his own role and those of his subordinates toward goal achievement. The ideal situation would, of course, be for an individual to have a high score on both scales, the high score on consideration being indicative of a climate of good rapport and the high score on structure being indicative of one who plays an active role in directing group activities.

The data was grouped into four groups: a pre-group for consideration scale, a pre-group for structure scale, a post-group for the consideration scale, and a post-group for the structure scale. Using this data, two t-tests were performed on the mean scores, pre versus post on consideration and pre versus post on structure. The results of these t-tests were not significant with

the largest mean difference being .74 with means around 50.0.

In an attempt to explain the non-significant findings, it was decided to evaluate the nature of the questions being asked by the questionnaire. In doing this it was noted that the wording of many of the questions was such that it would not be applicable to the participants who were primarily classroom teachers. Such questions as those including the term subordinates do not seem applicable in the case of a classroom teacher who has very few, for all practical purposes, superiors, and one can seriously doubt that the teachers think of their students as subordinates. Also the questionnaire refers to the unit in which a person works and this term would also most likely be quite unfamiliar to classroom teachers. These questions, of course, refer to the structure part of the questionnaire.

On the consideration scale such items as treating persons under you as equals would hardly be applicable in the view of a classroom teacher. Also such things as discussing just how much work needs to be done in the classroom with the students would also be confusing to the teachers. Another item, waiting for persons in the work unit to push new ideas, also seems highly inapplicable to the classroom situation as no teacher is likely to wait for his students to suggest the next topic of study. Another item, about making decisions for what and how the people under you shall do their tasks, seems to leave only one possible answer for the teacher in the classroom situation.

Overall it would appear that while the Leadership Opinion Questionnaire might be very valid in the industrial setting, its wording simply makes it inapplicable in the present setting of classroom teachers or perhaps even any setting outside that of industry. It is fairly obvious that some such instrument is called for that could be used in a more general setting and it may be possible that the Leadership Opinion Questionnaire could be used as a basis for constructing such an instrument.

ANALYSES OF THE FEEDBACK QUESTIONNAIRE*

A questionnaire consisting of fourteen items was administered to the participants of the workshop with the intention of finding details about their reaction to the experience. The responses were at times redundant and at times overlapped. The intention of the questions was to start from the global responses to the more specific items. The general impression is that there is a slight inconsistency in the responses of the participants in that they have sometimes made statements that have partly been contradicted in a later response. However, since this practice was not very widespread no attempt will be made here to analyze these occasional inconsistencies. The responses were examined in order of their position on the questionnaire and the data will be dealt with in that order.

Some of the questions could be answered in a "yes," "no," and "don't know" fashion. These responses were classified into mutually exclusive categories. However, other questions, namely numbers 1, 7, 11, 13(a), 13(b) and 14 were more open-ended. These responses were classified into several categories which are neither mutually exclusive nor comprehensive. Consequently, some answers were classified as falling into more than one category. The per cent in these questions are an indication of how many of the total number of respondents expressed that sentiment rather than a percentage of all the sentiments expressed. In all cases the percentages were rounded off.

*Pertinent tables pertaining to this analysis can be found on pp. 66-76.

The first question asked was whether the workshop met the expectations of the participants. Ninety-four per cent of the respondents stated that it did so, four per cent gave a qualified yes, and only one individual stated that it did not meet his expectations. He felt that there was too much "confrontation" between emerging leaders. The people who reported that the workshop did meet their expectations wholly or partially gave some details of how this was done. The responses indicated three main areas of concern. The first section (items 1 through 4 in Table 17, p.67) dealt with statements dealing with the person's self. The second section (items 5 through 7 in Table 17, p.67) emphasized the experience of the group as a whole. The third section (items 8 through 14) dealt with statements dealing with the workshop sometimes at a global level (items 8 through 10) and at others its more specific aspects (items 11 through 14). The last section dealt with statements that were categorized as "generalized."

A look at Table 17, p.67, shows that twenty-nine per cent of the respondents stated that they felt that their understanding of themselves was better. Another twenty-nine per cent felt that their relationships with other people were better. Nine per cent felt that their ability to communicate was better. Seven per cent felt that they were able to solve their problems more adequately. Some of the respondents did not talk directly about themselves but in their responses talked more of their participation as a group member. Ten per cent of these

felt that all of them understood each other better. One person mentions specifically that they were able to "air" their problems. One person felt that the opportunity to meet new people was very helpful. There were some comments made on the nature of the general workshop. Twenty-five per cent felt that the experience was relevant to their jobs. Ten per cent felt that the useful things were some specific techniques that they acquired during the experience. Seven per cent felt that the staff was good. One person specifically mentioned Dr. Busby as being good and one person mentioned that the workshop was better planned than last year. One person each also mentioned that the "RUPS" was good; one felt that it was bad. Some of the respondents felt that the experience was good but did not qualify the goodness of the experience or make any comments about how it generalized either to themselves or to their jobs or etc. This group constituted thirteen per cent.

The next question asked was if the experiences had made a person more or less competent to do inservice training, or if the degree of competence remained unchanged. Here (Table 18 , p. 69) ninety-nine per cent of the people felt that they were more competent and one person felt that his competence had remained the same. No one stated that he had become less competent due to the experience.

The third question (Table 19 , p. 69) dealt with their intentions to use innovative techniques in their classrooms or their feeling that these techniques were not applicable and that they did not plan to use

these. Here again the majority felt very positively and ninety-one per cent of the respondents felt that they would use innovative techniques in their classrooms. One person felt that the techniques were not applicable to the classroom and two people stated that they did not plan to use these techniques in their classroom. Three people, namely four per cent of the group, felt that the question was really not applicable at all. Since these responses were not qualified, it is difficult to assess what the group implied.

The fourth question (Table 20, p. 69) dealt with improvement in their skills in attacking problems. There was unanimous agreement that their skills in problem solving had improved as such.

The fifth question (Table 22, p. 71) dealt with their reaction to a particular section of the workshop and how meaningful the "RUPS" model was as a learning experience. The majority of the participants found the course meaningful. Twenty-eight per cent stated that it was "very meaningful" and fifty-seven stated that it was "meaningful." Thirteen per cent felt that it was only somewhat meaningful and one person felt that it was "meaningless."

Question six (Table 23 , p. 71) dealt with their opinion of whether "RUPS" model should be made available to all teachers in their inservice training. Eighty-five per cent of the participants felt that it should be made available and fifteen per cent had some doubts about this and could not make up their minds one way or the other.

Question seven (Table 21 , p. 70)asked them to describe three aspects of the life plan program and how it could be adopted in their back home situations. Twenty-one per cent of the respondents did not given any response to this particular aspect. Nineteen per cent mentioned "life focus and goals." Six per cent felt that it could point out common problems and another six per cent felt that it could help them understand values of the students. Twelve per cent felt that it could help them solve and understand their family, church, or the P.T.A. Nineteen per cent felt that they could understand the faculty and teachers somewhat better. Thirteen per cent mentioned one specific technique or the other. The thirteen per cent consisted of almost one person each mentioning such things as strength "perception bombardment," "life chart plan," "peak and weak experiences," "Joe-Harry window." Six per cent mentioned that the obituary and epitaph were helpful. Seven per cent felt that the feedback practice could be applied to the back home situation. Three per cent felt that the life plan program was partially useful and one person felt that it was of no help to him.

The eighth question (Table 24 , p. 71) asked whether they would recommend the life program to another group of teachers. The majority of the respondents felt that they would and a small minority either did not respond or felt that they would not. Ninety-one per cent of the respondents felt that they would recommend the life plan program to other sets of teachers and two people felt that they would not and six per cent did not give any opinion at all.

The ninth question (Table 26, p. 73) dealt with the usefulness of Dr. Busby's talk. Here the range of opinions is somewhat more varied. Sixteen per cent felt that the talk was "very useful" and forty per cent felt that it was "useful." Another large section, thirty-eight per cent felt that it was only slightly useful and four per cent felt that it was not useful at all and one person did not respond to the question.

The tenth question (Table 27, p. 73) dealt with the success of the triad T-groups and the degree to which they could make use of the learning opportunities provided in that experience. The majority of participants, namely sixty-two per cent, felt that it was successful and could be applied a great deal. Thirty-seven per cent felt that it could apply to some extent and one person felt that it could apply to a very small degree.

Question eleven (Table 25, p. 72) dealt with how their learning opportunities in these triad T-groups could be improved. The responses ranged over a series of topics. Fifteen per cent felt that their experiences could be improved by listening better. Presumably they referred to their own behavior in this case. Thirty-one per cent felt that if they could share their thoughts more or generally get more involved with the group the experience would be more meaningful. Twelve per cent felt that they needed more feedback. Some of these respondents specifically mentioned the need for more negative

feedback. Another large segment felt that more time needed to be spent on these experiences. This constituted eighteen per cent of the respondents. Thirteen per cent were critical of the trainers and stated that better trainers would have meant better learning experiences and one or two within this group felt that better planning, especially extraneous noise, that could be eliminated would have added to the experience. Ten per cent either did not know or had no suggestions to make. Nine per cent of the people did not respond. One or two people mentioned that the groups should have been smaller or that there should have been more exercises.

The twelfth question (Table 28 , p.73) dealt with their assessment of their involvement and commitment to their back home plans from this learning experience. A fairly large majority, namely sixty-five per cent of the participants, felt that their involvement could be rated as being pretty high, thirty-four felt that it was only some and one person felt that there was very little involvement.

Question thirteen (Table 29 , p.74 and Table 30, p.75) asked what experience concerning the problem solving back home helped them the most and what experiences in that same section of the workshop helped them the least. To the first section of the question (Table 29 , p.74), namely what helped them the most, ten per cent gave no response. Three per cent felt that nothing helped them the most. Twenty-four per cent felt that the "Force Field Analysis" helped them the most. Ten per cent

felt that the involvement of the county members was the most useful. Twelve per cent felt that the experience consisted of problems being brought out and some of them being solved. Three per cent felt that it led to a greater involvement on the part of others and four per cent felt that it involved into selecting specific problems. Nine per cent felt that it brought out a sense of priority of what things are most necessary. Six per cent felt that the T-group aspect of the experience was most helpful. Four per cent felt that the similarity of problems occurring across the groups seemed helpful to them. Another six per cent felt that the fact that almost everybody participated equally was the most helpful. One person each mentioned some specific item such as the fact of "staying in the group and fighting it out," "feedback," "commitment to tasks and to goals," "RUPS model," and "building the monument." One person felt that the whole experience had little use for him. In the second half of the question (Table 30 , p. 75) where they were asked to mention what experiences were least helpful, forty-six per cent did not respond whereas four per cent stated that everything was useful. Three per cent felt that the need to get consensus was least helpful and seven per cent felt that too much time was spent on "reporting." Three per cent felt that knowing the long range goals that are not capable of being solved was not helpful and another three per cent felt that writing things down that would not be carried out anyway was not helpful. Seven per cent felt that "building the monument" was least helpful. A number of people mentioned one specific

item as such. These varied from saying that the last section of the workshop or the methods of gaining confidence from people or the lack of adequate time for the triads were least helpful. One respondent each also mentioned such things as that the teachers did not want to bring the issues out and were very stubborn, another mentioned a lack of discipline in the group or a lack of thoughtfulness or explosive remarks or emphasis on sexual jokes by the trainer. However, these responses were given by a total of thirteen per cent. This cannot be constituted as one category since the responses covered a wide range of complaints though only one person mentioned the specific complaint in each case.

The last question, number fourteen (Table 31 , p. 76) asked for any additional comments that the respondents wanted to make. Here a large section, namely forty-three per cent, did not make any comments. Eighteen per cent of the respondents hoped for personal benefits out of the workshop. Another nineteen per cent commented that the experience was either enjoyable or useful to them. Another equally large section of the respondents, namely about twenty per cent, mentioned one specific event at a time. These responses ranged so widely over a range of topics that they could not be categorized into small categories and in each case only one person mentioned that particular item. The respondents stated that the workshop was helpful for poverty, another thought it was helpful to the county program, a third was critical of a trainer, another was critical of a trainer because of too much emphasis on sex, another was critical of the superintendent and the principal,

another felt that the participants had reacted the way it had been planned (presumably by the trainers). One felt that there was too much structure and one felt that it might be useful for other people but he did not think it did him any good. It may be stated that the fourteenth question was somewhat redundant and most of them had already made some statements under question one and had given their opinions in that matter.

Looking over the tables it might seem that there was one individual who felt that he got absolutely nothing out of the workshop he had expected. An exmaination of the responses shows that it was not the same individual who said that he got nothing but invariably one person felt that he got nothing out of the specific section of the workshop and not the same person replied in the negative under the various items.

In summary it may be stated that the general response was positive. The majority of the participants were satisfied with the way the workshop was run. There are instances of specific complaints spread over the range of responses. Numerically, they constitute a minority. How relevant and how focal these criticisms are can only be determined in view of the general goals of the workshop.

Table 16

Q 1. Did the workshop meet your expectations?

	No.	%
Yes	64	94%
Yes and No	3	3%
No	1	1%

Table17

Q 1. Ways in which workshop met expectations

		No.	%
Emphasis on self			
1.	"My understanding of self is better."	20	29%
2.	"My understanding of relationships with others is better."	20	29%
3.	"My ability to communicate is better."	6	9%
4.	"My ability to solve problems is better."	5	7%
Emphasis on group			
5.	"All of us understand each other better."	7	10%
6.	"We aired our problems."	1	1%
7.	"We met new people."	1	1%
Emphasis on workshop			
8.	"Workshop was relevant to my job."	17	25%
9.	"Workshop was relevant to student-teacher relationships."	1	1%
10.	"Workshop offered good techniques."	7	10%
11.	"Workshop staff was good."	5	7%
12.	Workshop better planned	1	1%

Table 17 (Cont'd.)

	No.	%
13. RUPS was good	1	1%
14. RUPS was bad	1	1%
Generalized statement without reference to specifics		
15. Generally good	9	13%

Table 18

Q 2. Competency to do In-Service Training

	No.	%
A. More Competent	67	99%
B. Less Competent	0	-
C. Remained the Same	1	1%

Table 19

Q 3. Plans to use Innovative Technique

	No.	%
A. Yes	62	91%
B. None Applicable	1	1%
C. No	2	3%
Question not applicable	3	4%

Table 20

Q 4. Skills in Problem Solving

	No.	%
A. Improved	68	100%
B. Not Improved	0	-
C. No	0	-

Table 21

Q 7. Description of three aspects of Life Plan Program that could be adopted to back home situations.

	No.	%
1. No response	14	21%
2. Life Focus and goals	13	19%
3. Points up common problems	4	6%
4. Helps solve problems	4	6%
5. Helps in understanding student values	10	15%
6. Helps in understanding family, church, or PTA	8	12%
7. Helps in understanding faculty and teachers	13	19%
8. Mention of specific techniques, e.g., life-chart, peak and weak experiences and Jo-Harry window	9	13%
9. Obituary and epitaph	4	6%
10. Feedback	5	7%
11. Partially good	2	3%
12. No help	1	1%

Table 22

Q 5. RUPS Model

	No.	%
A. Very Meaningful	19	28%
B. Meaningful	39	57%
C. Somewhat Meaningful	9	13%
D. Meaningless	1	1%

Table 23

Q 6. Should RUPS Model be made available?

	No.	%
A. Yes	58	85%
B. No	0	-
C. Am Not Sure	10	15%

Table 24

Q 8. Would you recommend the Life Plan Program?

	No.	%
A. Yes	62	91%
B. No	2	3%
Did Not Answer	4	6%

Table 25

Q 11. How learning opportunities could be improved in the Triad T-Group

	No.	%
1. No response	6	9%
2. By listening better	10	15%
3. By sharing thoughts or by becoming more involved	21	31%
4. By more feedback	8	12%
5. By all participants being from the same county	2	3%
6. By fewer people	1	1%
7. By more exercises	2	3%
8. By more time being spent on it	12	18%
9. By having better trainers or better planning	9	13%
10. No suggestions	7	10%

Table 26

Q 9. Usefulness of Dr. Busby's Talk

	No.	%
A. Very Useful	11	16%
B. Useful	27	40%
C. Slightly Useful	26	38%
D. Not Useful	3	4%
Did Not Answer	1	1%

Table 27

Q 10. Success of Triad T-Groups

	No.	%
A. A Great Deal	42	62%
B. Some	25	37%
C. Very Little	1	1%

Table 28

Q 12. Involvement and Commitment to Back Home Plans

	No.	%
A. A Great Deal	44	65%
B. Some	23	34%
C. Very Little	1	1%

Table 29

Q 13a. Experience that was helpful in the "Problems solving for back home" section.

	No.	%
1. No response	7	10%
2. None were helpful	2	3%
3. Force field analysis	16	24%
4. Involving of county personnel	7	10%
5. Problems were brought out and solved	8	12%
6. Getting others involved	2	3%
7. Selecting the problems	3	4%
8. Realizing "things that are necessary"	6	9%
9. T-groups	4	6%
10. Similarity of problems	3	4%
11. Understanding PTA organization	1	1%
12. Feedback	1	1%
13. Commitment to the task	1	1%
14. RUPS	1	1%
15. Building the monument	1	1%
16. Equal participation by all	4	6%
17. Staying in the group and "fighting it out"	1	1%
18. "Going from large perception to small detail"	1	1%

Table 30

Q 13b. Least helpful experience in the problem solving for back home.

	No.	%
1. No response	31	46%
2. Was bored by some	1	1%
3. It was all useful	3	4%
4. Giving consensual answers	2	3%
5. Too much time spent on reporting	5	7%
6. Large group work	1	1%
7. Knowing long range goals that are not soluble	2	3%
8. Writing things that will not be carried out	2	3%
9. Not enough time for triads	20	30%
10. Noise	2	3%
11. Monument	5	7%
12. The last section	1	1%
13. Methods of gaining confidence in people	1	1%
14. Teachers being stubborn	1	1%
15. Lack of discipline	1	1%
16. Brainstorming	1	1%
17. Force theory	1	1%
18. Triads	1	1%
19. Specific behavior of trainers	2	3%

Table 31

Q 14. Additional comments

	No.	%
1. No response	30	44%
Negative or partially negative comments		
2. Criticism of a trainer	2	3%
3. Too much emphasis on sex	1	1%
4. Too much structure	1	1%
5. Criticism of superintendents and principals	1	1%
6. "We reacted the way it had been planned" (connotation of hidden agenda)	1	1%
7. Useful for others but not me	1	1%
Positive remarks		
8. Hope for personal benefits	12	18%
9. Enjoyable or useful experience	13	19%
10. Best workshop so far	1	1%
11. Helpful for problems of poverty	1	1%
12. Helpful for the county	1	1%
13. Meet new people	1	1%
14. Other teachers should also get it	1	1%
15. More aware of new people	1	1%

PART II

FINAL EVALUATION

As has been mentioned earlier (p. 1) this section will attempt to evaluate the three years Human Relations Training Program. An effort will be made to discuss the shortcomings and achievements of this program. In the end the program will be evaluated in terms of the overall goals of Title III as stated in Design for Tennessee Assessment and Evaluation of Title III ESEA (3). This evaluation of the Title III program will be concerned only with the Human Relations Training aspect of this Title III program because the writer has not been involved in any other aspect of this particular Title III program, hence, he is not in a position to make any judgements in any other context.

Shortcomings.

Shortcomings of this program will be discussed under the following general headings:

a. Administrative and budgetary limitations;

b. Theoretical, methodological and design shortcomings.

Administrative and Budgetary Limitations.

If the writer were asked to list the one single most important limitation in this program, it would have to be the budgetary restrictions. During the third year of the program the budget was transferred from the federal government to the State government and adequate monies needed for a comprehensive evaluation of the Human Relations Program could not be budgeted according to the advice given to the writer by the director of the project. For instance, during the planning stages of the third year program the writer specifically recommended that adequate

funds should be made available for travel of the researchers for data collection, and for payment of the subjects in the control group. As the research progressed, the writer was advised that no such funds were available and that he had to make the best use of the limited funds available. In the writer's opinion this definitely effected the comprehensiveness of the last year's evaluation. No funds were available to hire adequately trained interviewers nor were any funds available to train untrained interviewers adequately. As is evident from Part I, clinical interview formed the foundation stone of the third year's evaluation. In the writer's opinion a scientific evaluation is far more important for future planning even at the expense of extensiveness of any program.

It must be stated that the director of the project was quite cooperative and helped the writer in all manners possible within the budgetary limitations.

For reasons unknown to the present writer, no systematic evaluation was planned during the first year of the program in spite of the state guidelines (3) being very clear about the necessity of doing so. Towards the end of the first year's program at the writer's insistence with the then project director, he was allowed to prepare a rough and hurried questionnaire to get a quick feedback from the participants. These responses were tabulated and the results presented at the Tennessee Psychological Association's annual meeting (28). It is felt that so far as a comprehensive evaluation is concerned no effort was made towards it during the first year and this had to be an administrative decision. It was at the writer's insistence that the

project director during the second year of the program decided to think seriously about an evaluation. The report on these findings is enclosed in Appendix B.

Theoretical, Methodological and Design Shortcomings

It would be helpful to give a brief overview of the project as it is hoped that this will make the criticisms in this area more meaningful.

Human relations training techniques were used with educators and educational administrators in the Upper Cumberland Region for a period of three years. At this point we might take a broad look over what transpired and come up with some statements about what might be done for the future or what indications one can arrive at from a general examination of the whole program.

Briefly, let us examine what transpired. In the first year of the program a group of educators recommended by their superiors for human relations training program were sent to a central location where they went through two weeks of human relations training and met subsequently on a number of Saturdays. As has been mentimned above, accept for the administration of a hurriedly prepared feedback questionnaire for the first year no assessment of changes taking place was made.

The second year 150 participants went through a similar experience. At this t ime, a comprehensive assessment program was instituted. A complete report of this program has already been submitted (Appendix B). Measures derived from such different theoretical models of personality as Leary, Cattel, Sheestrom (15,41,35), and Frankel-Brunswik (/) were used in order to assess these changes. Not all of the 150 were apparently present at the several points in time when the tests were given but for the most part the large majority of

the 150 took a pretest consisting of several measures at the beginning of the human relations training laboratory. They took post-test I right after the three week intensive training period and a post-test II after six months of the training period. A control group of 50 went through the pretest procedures and the post-test II procedures. Practical financial limitations did not allow the control group to get the testing at the time of the post-test I.

In summary, the results of the massive assessment program were that the participants had changed and that the change had occurred in different directions and at different places (see Appendix B).

The massive assessment program also attempted to see if those who came in contact with these participants, namely, their superiors and their students, perceived them differently. Here again, some differences were found (see Appendix B).

During the third year of the program only 11 participants were involved in another series of human relations training techniques (p. 6). At this time, no large scale assessment was attempted since it would have essentially been a duplication of the assessment done in the second year. These participants, however, gave subjective reactions to the intensive training program at the end of the three weeks.

Approximately six months later, 19 of these participants (experimental group) were followed up in interviews.

It was decided to use intensive open-ended clinical interview techniques for the third year to gather as much information as possible about the changes based on the external criteria (p. 4 , Appendix B) and to supplement the findings of the second year about the external criteria changes.

A group of 18 other educators and educational administrators (control group) were also interviewed in order to make comparisons. A still smaller number of principals of these two groups, namely, nine of the experimental group and 12 of the control, sent back the ratings of these persons concerned. We, then, have varying degrees of data collected at various times.

As reported earlier, it is apparent that the participants in the human relations program training changed along various dimensions. In order to get a clearer picture of what kind of changes occurred and in what directions these changes took, one might proceed by first asking what is meant by the "human relations training techniques." As we know (4), the terms connote different programs for different groups. Each set of trainers sets up a different type of a training program, depending on his theoretical allegiance as well as value systems. Looking at the program itself as described elsewhere (pp. 78-80), we find that the program changed and evolved from the first year to the third year. The trainers themselves changed though a few of them remained constant over the three years. The program evolved as a function of what the trainers who stayed within the program regarded as the most useful experience for the teachers. One would assume that these judgements were based on the trainers' prior experiences with the types of groups that they had dealt with. It would be interesting to see what role the trainers played in this enterprise. As the psychotherapy research has shown (Marmor), any such person playing such a dominant role in a group invariably transmits his value systems to those who come in close contact with him. It would be interesting, therefore, to know

what the value systems of these trainers were. We do not as yet have any stated goals of the trainers or of the program as such apart from a global statement that the intention was to make the teacher more effective.

Since the assessment program in the second year showed that all types of changes occurred in the participants, the value systems of the trainers could be made a point of inquiry and one of focal interest in a similar enterprise in the future. We do know from the literature that during recent years greater and greater emphasis has been placed on what may best be described as the experimenter variable, that is, the participant observer plays a more active role than had been assumed previously. It would, therefore, be logical for any major assessment program to take into account the differences within the trainers and how these differences in their interactions with the participants relate to the changes brought about within the participants. At the present juncture, a certain amount of selection within the trainers took place. One would presume that these were due to such factors as interpersonal relationships between the trainers, their own life situations, their degree of involvement in the program, and such other matters that were conducive to their making judgements in one direction or another. So one of the major points not covered in the present assessment program is the role of the trainer; the effects his value systems, his personality, his stated goals have on these participants. Perhaps along with the participants, the trainers should take the same measures themselves in order to establish the differences along the same dimensions.

Secondly, one should also ask the trainers to state clearly

what they regard as their goals. It is apparent in any research that the results of the training program are never completely determined by the stated goals of that program. Serendipity is a common phenomenon, and one wonders, therefore, why it would be useful to have these goals made explicit. The theoretical rationale for making one's intentions overt is that it would help a better integration of future programs and also help to test out the subjective convictions of the trainers of what in their program is useful or what is not. One may learn a little from the vast and conflicting research in the broad field of psychotherapy that not everything a therapist does is regarded as important by others around them or by those who are exposed to their treatment. If any clarification is to be sought in the field, such a program becomes imperative.

Before proceeding to talk about some of the things that we can learn from the data itself, we might briefly mention some of other shortcomings of the program as such. The shortcomings unfortunately detract from the importance of the findings as well as the degree to which one can generalize from these findings to other groups no matter how closely similar they might be. One of the major shortcomings of the program appears to be the choice of samples. Samples were chosen not according to statistical procedures which would maximize the generalization of results but according to judgements made by either the superiors or the trainers.

In the first two years, the participants were chosen on the recommendation of their superiors, a fact which would cloud the subsequent finding that these superiors then proceeded to find these

participants as generally being more effective than a group of controls who did not go through such an experience.

In the original proposal for this program, the following comments are made regarding the selection of the sample:

> A total of 150 principals and teachers will be recommended by their superintendents for participation in the training program. These will be selected by the Title III staff on the basis of their professional qualifications and willingness to participate.

No rationale for using this procedure of sample selection is given in the proposal.

In the third year, the participants were chosen on the basis of judgements made by the trainers as those who would potentially gain the most. These participants had been through either of the two prior workshops. What kinds of covert or overt biases were playing a part in this assessment cannot really be judged because we do not have the data. Such a selection procedure would further cast doubt on the broad generalizations one can make from these findings in view of the fact that during the second year the experimental group found the trainers, the principals, and superiors as being more powerful than the control group did (see p. 32 of Appendix B). In view of the general findings mentioned above, namely, the role of the trainer, this additional confirmation subjectively experienced by the participants would make it more explicit that the basis for the selection be made somewhat more covert. The trainers had the data of the massive assessment program conducted during the second year and results on various tests of how the participants had changed or not changed. None of these objective indices were chosen as a basis for selection. It was not possible to

follow this procedure due to budgetary restrictions as it would have meant the expenditure of more professional time than what was available within the budget limits.

It is feasible that the interviewers clinically tapped the same people who would have been chosen on the basis of these dimensions. However, it is also feasible that such factors as mutual liking and degree of rapport with the participants were the major determinants of this choice. If it were feasible, it would be interesting to see the characteristics of the participants chosen by the trainers.

The method of choosing control group in the third year is open to criticism that it is not a randomly selected sample. Again, this procedure of selection (p.8) was decided upon due to cost factors as it would have entailed a lot more expense to choose matched control subjects on a random basis.

We are not unaware of the practical problems involved in the selection of such a sample. The difficulty of getting people to come to a central place cannot possibly be underestimated. In this light, it may be stated that most of the participants had come in not on a voluntary basis necessarily but because of the recommendations made by the superior and the subtle coercive nature of such a recommendation as well as financial rewards that they got because of such a participation. It may be remembered that in this region (p.4) a financial reward of such a nature is a very great incentive and not something to be ignored.

One also must realize the handicaps that a team of outsiders, as at least some of the trainers were, encounters when dealing with the type of region that we are dealing with here (Cummins & Cummins, 1957).

These shortcomings should be kept in mind as things that one would ideally not like to have had occurred but were unavoidable within the confines of the sociological context perhaps.

It has been mantioned earlier (p.7) that due to budgetary restrictions it was not possible to select carefully all the interviewers nor was it possible to give them extensive training in the type of interview (p.79) used in this investigation. Four interviewers, three of whom had been trainers in the Human Relations workshops, interviewed the control and the experimental groups.

A careful examination of the interview data showed a range of differences within the interviews. Unfortunately, the data is not available for a in depth statistical analysis to assess the effect of the interviewers. It seems obvious, however, that the interviewers differed somewhat in the type of interviewing they did. For example, some interviewers stuck closely to a series of ten questions that had been prepared as a guide for interviews and asked more direct and structured questions whereas other interviewers used their ten questions as a guide in an open-ended type of interview. There were also differences in the degree to which the interviewer asked for dates that substantiated the statement made by the participants. For example, whereas one interviewer may get a response as, "I feel quite different this year and I feel that I have done things differently," another interviewer went on to find out examples of the types of differences the participant in question was talking about and found incidences of where this had occurred. Not all of the respondents covered the same areas of their life. There were instances where a respondent had not covered a certain

point and obviously was not specifically asked by the interviewer.

We do not know the effect of such variables as the halo effect. In other words we do not know how many of the students (p.97, Appendix B) knew that their teachers had or had not been to the human relations training workshops. We do not know how many were even aware of such a workshop and what psychological meaning it had for them. However in view of the predominantly negative picture painted by the students of their teachers, it is apparent that the halo effect if it was present was not really pronounced. As compared to the students the principals' ratings did not show many changes. The general tendency of the principals not to make any negative statements about those that they were rating, reduced the effectiveness of the scale being used.

It is interesting to see that when the control group was interviewed, during the last year of the project, they had no hesitation in talking about the problems they encountered in their life. Generally speaking, one gets the impression that the control group is more preoccupied with the external events and talks more about the changes that have occurred in their role structures, the obstacles they face and the frustration they experience in their daily routine. As compared to this the experimental group, in this case, has a greater preoccupation with their own reactions and their own effectiveness and do not concentrate as much on the external surroundings as do the control. Here again we may mention that they were being interviewed by trainers with whom they had by now clearly associated the "culture" of the Human Relations training workshop. In fact the two groups differ markedly in which they interpret the interview

questions and the connotations they place on the same words. What their responses would have been made had the assessment been done by outsiders who did not clearly belong to a part of the program, it is difficult to say. Interestingly enough the followup group of 19 did not pass on the forms for the principals' ratings to the same degree that the control group did. Whether this was a function of the greater preoccupation with one's own goal and a reduced preoccupation with one's surroundings or whether some other factors were at play, it is difficult to judge. Only nine out of the 18 who have been interviewed have a principal's rating on them as opposed to 12 out of the control.

It has already been repeatedly pointed out that budgetary considerations were responsible for the above mentioned shortcomings.

One may mention here that any program that is undertaken by any set of administrators anywhere, if it is to be used as a source of applicable information to other areas, must within it have an assessment program. The commitment to the assessment program, therefore, should be regarded as a major one and the nature of the assessment should not be allowed to suffer in preference of the size of the program itself. It is, of course, a matter of ultimate value judgement but it seems not so far fetched to say that a complex and comprehensive program without any assessment would not be worth much whereas a smaller program with a clear idea of where it stands, what it can perpetuate, and what it can curtail in the long range of a greater beneficial value not only to the administrators but also to the communities for which such programs are instituted.

Achievements

Let us now turn our attention towards recapitulating some of the achievements of this program which have been presented in Part I of this report and are contained in Appendix B. It is felt that the evaluation in spite of the shortcomings mentioned earlier does demonstrate clearly that educators do change significantly as a result of being exposed to human relations training program.

As is evidenced from Appendix B that in line with Martin's (1957) and Campbell and Dunnett's (1968) distinction of internal and external criteria for change, the present program attempted to study changes produced as a result of human relations training along both these dimensions. Several studies have attempted to study these changes (Bennis, Burk, Cutter, Herrington, & Hoffman, 1957; Burk & Bennis, 1961) but without the use of control groups. One pioneering aspect of the present evaluation that cannot be ignored is that it is possibly for the first time that a systematic attempt has been made to use matched control groups (in spite of budgetary limitations) to rule out any placebo effects. There are numerous studies available in the literature (Tohman, Zenger, & Wechsler, 1959; Massarih & Carlson, 1962) that have attempted to study the effects of human relations training without using control groups and this has resulted in the difficulty that no definite conclusions can be drawn about the findings.

It has been demonstrated that the educators became less authoritarian as a result of their exposition to human relations training (p. 7 , Appendix B). More specifically, this implies that they became less superstitious and more open minded. They became less rigid in their thinking and could handle their hostilities in a more realistic manner.

It seems that as a result of exposition to this program, the educators became more time competent, thereby implying that they were able to tie the past and the future to the present in a meaningful continuity. They developed greater faith in the future without rigid or overly realistic goals. It also seems that the educators' ability to use good judgement in the application of values also increased.

There is also some evidence that they became more sensitive to their own needs and feelings and their self-regard was enhanced in a marked fashion.

The educators started accepting themselves a little better in spite of their weaknesses. There was also an appreciable increase in the capacity for intimate contact with other human beings as a result of exposition to human relations training.

The present evaluation of the program has also demonstrated that as a result of exposition to human relations training, the educators saw themselves as good and forceful leaders; they said

that they liked responsibility and giving orders. Evidence is also presented to point out that the participants in the program became more straightforward and direct in their relationship to others and they reported to have become less rebellious and less distrustful of others. They also said that they were less timid and less self-punishing. They said that they were able to look at themselves realistically and criticize themselves if necessary.

It also seems that exposition to human relations training program enabled them to develop a realistic respect for authority and they became appreciative of the help of others. They viewed themselves as giving more freely of themselves and helping others. They also felt that they had become more considerate.

It also seems that the participants who were exposed to human relations training were viewed more positively by their principals and supervisors as compared to a matched control group.

There is also some evidence to point towards the fact that teachers who have been exposed to human relations training are viewed differently by the students as compared to teachers who have not had a chance to undergo such training. In this context, it is of interest to quote the most relevant portion of the findings contained in detail in Appendix B. On page 92 of this appendix it is mentioned:

> It is apparent that if a student has been interacting with a teacher who has been through the Human Relations Training, he is more likely to be involved with such activities as

learning, studying, preparing for the future, as feeling a sense of identity with the teacher whose punishing activities he perceived as being for his own good, as seeing the future to be good and as seeing his own actions to some extent being determined by himself than if he gets a teacher who has not had such training.

The data generated on the basis of feedback questionnaires and the present evaluation (pp. 54-65) indicate that the participants perceived the programs very positively and felt that this would be of tremendous use to them in their back home situations. At this stage of the present research, there is no way to find out whether or not they will be able to put their intentions into actions. This is a function of the passage of time, and one has to wait to find out the long term effects of such a training.

In the interview analysis contained on pages (3-42) of Part I, it has been clearly demonstrated that experimental and control groups reacted differently and do perceive the changes within themselves as being different. The great majority of the experimental group members felt that the greatest amount of change within them had come due to the human relations training. As opposed to this, the controls mentioned several events in the course of their lives not related to human relations training in the same period of time which had led up to the greatest amount of change in them.

There is also evidence that the experimental group visited the communities more and took part more in the local politics as compared to the control group. They had started introducing human relations training in their churches and they had better and closer relationships with the local county officials than they used to.

There is evidence to show that members of the experimental group became more active in their relationship with the PTA and tried to talk with the students' parents more and they tried to mix with the people more and point out how they felt. This was not the case among the members of the control group.

It seems that as a result of the exposition to human relations training, the educators in the experimental group reported they had become more accepting and reported solving more problems in their jobs and communities than they used to as compared to the control group.

It also seems that as a result of exposition to human relations training, the educators started initiating new activities in their school systems and with their students. They seemed to be interacting more with their students as compared to the control group members. It is also interesting to note that they let their students take part in planning and trying to find out what the students' interests were, and this was not done by persons who had not been exposed to human relations training program.

It also seems that the human relations training helped the

educators to communicate better with their superiors and their peers. They felt freer in expressing their opinions, they felt less inferior, and felt more confident in their relationships, and some of them felt closer to their principals.

Summary

The present evaluation has clearly demonstrated very significant changes on the basis of the external and internal criteria for the persons who participated in the human relations training program. It seems that not only one's personality changes significantly as a result of exposition to such a training program, but it seems that one is able to function better at his job and in his community. One seems to have more satisfying life in his environment. It is safe to say that the human relations program enables one to become a better teacher.

It would be interesting to make a few general comments about the role and status of a teacher in our society vis-a-vis human relations training.

Generally speaking, across the nation the role of the teacher has not been one of either very great sociological power or one accorded the respect and status that the teacher has enjoyed in previous centuries and in other places. The teacher has had to bear the brunt of society's problems and has had to share in the blames more than its rewards. One may mention here that the

sociological nature of the area in question has generally perhaps been kinder to its teachers than other parts of the country have been. The teacher in these areas is not at the bottom of the totem pole. Economically, even though he must of necessity depend on supplementary income in order to make both ends meet, he is not too far down the socioeconomic ladder as his colleagues in major suburban sections are. Because of the general lower educational value of the populus at large in the area, he is also bound to be awarded greater status and respect than the general school teacher gets in other parts.

With this in mind, we may then reflect that any investment in the teacher becomes an investment for the future. How then should this investment be best utilized? One may wonder whether the technical skills given to these teachers should be enhanced. Whether it would be better for them to be sent back to school and their academic skills strengthened. In view of the Peter Principle, one would suspect that too high powered a training in this area would pretty soon make them incompetent for the job they are to do. In this sense, the more relevant material especially in view of the large social unrest in the country as such would seem to be the improvement of the social skills of the teacher, particularly his relationships with his students and with those that he works with within the social structure. This would be far more relevant an area to concentrate on than sending him to graduate school where he

may have a better understanding of Einstein's theory but not be able to understand the students he deals with. The general discontent across the country and the so-called rebellion of the young would further emphasize the need for the teacher to become a greater social participant than a greater academician, though, of course, we must recognize that such divisions are not mutually exclusive. If then we are to concentrate on the teacher, what kind of values would one hope to instill and what kinds of methods would one use most profitably and at what stages? The training sessions aimed at enhancing the teachers' human relations skills. The assessment programs give some indication of how and where these changes occur most. Human relations training seems to be a very powerful tool for inculcating these skills in an educator.

The design for Tennessee Assessment and Evaluation of Title III, ESEA (3) while discussing the goals of Title III funds states, "Title III funds can provide the means for exploring new ideas, new ways, and demonstrating different means of attacking identified educational problems. Title III should be a vehicle for change by providing funds for coping with problem areas. There is an implied obligation in the long range strategy of the Title III to coordinate programs funded from this source and the funds from other sources, with an expectation that other sources can and will be available for continuing those programs that hold the greatest promise."

In light of these stated goals of Title III funding, it can safely be said that the present program so far as its human relations training component is concerned certainly represents a pioneering effort in the exploration of new ideas and new ways of making the teachers more effective on their jobs. It has demonstrated an innovative and a relatively sure means of attacking this very difficult problem of teacher improvement.

Because of the pioneering nature of this evaluation, the writer has been approached by several publishers about writing a book on the implications and findings of this program. Several scientific papers have been presented at professional meetings in the United States and abroad about the exciting results of this program. A partial list of these is enclosed on page 106 of Appendix A.

As has been hinted earlier, it is difficult to say whether or not this program would be continued by all the participants from the various school systems in their own environment, but the data suggest that they would like to do so in case they could obtain adequate funding for such operations. There is also some evidence to indicate that some of the participants are already using techniques they learned during this training to teach their classes and to relate to peers and superiors and are also trying to make use of their new knowledge in the communities and churches.

It is felt that a long range follow-up of the participants is very necessary to find out as to what happens eventually in the schools and communities as a result of exposition to human relations training.

In case such a program were to be recycled in the future, suitable steps should be taken to overcome the shortcomings mentioned on pages 78-70. If one can get enough funds and the resultant professionally trained manpower, it should not be at all difficult to overcome the shortcomings that were described. From an administrative point of view, it would seem very necessary that the evaluator consult with the administrators before a budget request is made and that adequate monies should be made available to conduct a more comprehensive evaluation.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Adorno, T. W., Brunswik-Frenkel, E., Levinson, D. J., & Sanford, N. The Authoritarian Personality. Harper and Row, 1950.

2. Andrew, G., Hartwell, S., Hutt, M., & Walton, R. The Michigan Picture Test. Chicago: Science Research Association.

3. Bellott, F. K. Design for Tennessee Assessment and Evaluation of Title III ESEA. Memphis State University, College of Eduacation, Bureau of Education Research and Services, Memphis, Tennessee, 1969.

4. Birnbaum, M. Sense and nonsense about sensitivity training. Saturday Review, 1969.

5. Burke, H. L., Burke, R., Cutter, H., Harrington, H., & Hoffman, J. A note on some problems of measurement and prediction in a training group. Group Psychotherapy, 1957, 10, 328-341.

6. Burke, H. L., & Bennis, W. G. Changes in perception of self and others during human relations training. Human Relations, 1961, 14, 165-182.

7. Campbell, J. P., & Dunnette, M. D. Effectiveness of T-group experiences in managerial training and development. Psychological Bulletin, 1968, 70, 73-104.

8. Cattell, R. B. Personality: A systematic theoretical and factual study. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1950.

9. Cattell, R. B., Horn, J. L., Sweeny, A. B., & Radcliffe, J. Motivation Analysis Test. Champaign, Illinois: Institute for Personality and Ability Testing, 1964.

10. Cummin, E., & Cummin, J. Closed ranks. Cambridge (Mass.): Harvard University Press, 1957.

11. Fleishman, E. A. Manual for Leadership Opinion Questionnaire. Chicago: Science Research Associations, 1969.

12. Guilford, J. P. Fundamental Statistics in Psychology and Education. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1965.

13. Jung, C., & Lippitt, R. Utilization of scientific knowledge for change in education. Theory into Practice. Portland (Oregon): Research Utilizing Problem Solving, 1966.

14. Leary, T. Interpersonal Diagnosis of Personality. New York: Ronald Press, 1956.

15. Leary, T. Multilevel Measurement of Interpersonal Behavior. Berkely, California: Psychological Consultation Service, 1956.

16. Marmon, J. Psychoanalytic theory as an education process: Common denominators in the therapeutic approaches of different psychoanalytic "schools." Presented to Academy of Psychoanalysis. Chicago: 1961.

17. Martin, H. O. The assessment of training. Personnel Management, 1957, 39, 88-93.

18. Maslow, A. Towards a Psychology of Being. New York: Van Nostrand, 1962.

19. Massarih & Carlson. Effectiveness of T-group experiences in managerial training and development. Psychological Bulletin, 1968, 70, 73-104.

20. Murray, H. A. Thematic Apperception Test. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1943.

21. Norman, D. Description and characteristics of the Upper Cumberland Region. Unpublished chapter for a proposed book on Title III Program of Overton County Board of Education.

22. Osgood, C., & Tannenbaum, R. Measurement of Meaning. Oxford University Press, 1955.

23. Rotter, J. B. Social Learning and Clinical Psychology. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, 1954.

24. Ryan, D. G. Characteristics of Teachers. American Council of Education, Washington, 1960.

25. Shostrom, E. Personal Orientation Inventory. San Diego: Educational and Industrial Testing Service, 1966.

26. Siegel, S. Non-Parametric Statistics for the Behavioral Sciences. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1956.

27. Snedecor, G. Statistical Methods Applied to Experiments in Agriculture and Biology. Iowa State University, 1962.

28. Stewart, O. C., & Khanna, J. L. A Humanistic Approach to Inservice Training of Teachers. Paper presented at the Tennessee Psychological Association Meetings, 1967.

29. Thurstone, L. L. Primary Mental Abilities. Psychometric Monograph, No. 1, lx.

30. Thurstone, L. L. Factor Analysis as a Scientific Method with Special Reference to the Analysis of Human Traits. In Wirth, L. (1940), Eleven Twenty-Six, a Decade of Social Science Research. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, pp. 78-112.

31. Thurstone, L. L. Multiple Factor Analysis. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1947.

32. Winer, B. J. Statistical Principles in Experimental Design. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1962.

APPENDIX A

1. Khanna, J. L. "A 'Discovery Learning' Approach to the In-Service Training." Proceedings of the 1968 Annual Convention of the APA.

2. Khanna, J. L., & Stewart, O. C. "Use of Sensitivity Training with Educators." Paper presented at the 1967 meetings of the TPA. (In press)

3. Khanna, J. L. "Social Psychological Approaches to Personality Assessment across Cultures." American Psychologist, 24, No. 7, 686, July, 1969.

4. Khanna, J. L. "Human Relations Training and Education." Proceedings of the Second International Congress of Social Psychiatry. London, England, pp. 65-68.

5. Khanna, J. L., & Eber, H. W. "Motivation Changes in T-Groups." Presented at the April, 1970 SEPA meetings.

6. Khanna, J. L., & Wesch, J. E. "Effects of Human Relations Training on Self-Perception." Presented at the April, 1970 SEPA meetings.

7. Khanna, J. L. "Some Research Results to Discuss the Effects of Training on Educators." Presented at the 1970 SEPA meetings.

8. Khanna, J. L. "Training Groups in Education." Presented at April, 1970 Southwestern Psychological Association meetings.

FEEDBACK
QUESTIONNAIRE

We are very interested in learning about your reactions to the three weeks workshop. We will greatly appreciate your honest and frank answers to the following questions. We do not want you to give your name.

1. Did the workshop meet your expectation? Yes_____ No_____

   a) If yes, in what ways?_____
   _____
   _____

   b) If no, why not?_____
   _____
   _____

2. Please check one of the following:

   a) I feel that this experience has made me more competent to do in-service training in the back home situation._____

   b) I feel that this experience has made me less competent to do in-service training in the back home situation._____

   c) My competency for in-service training has remained the same._____

3. Please check one of the following: As a result of this experience:

   a) I plan to use innovative techniques in my classroom._____

   b) I feel that none of these techniques are applicable in the classroom._____

   c) I do not plan to use any of these techniques in my classroom._____

4. Do you feel that as a result of this experience:

   a) Your skills in problem solving have improved._____

   b) Your skills in problem solving have not improved._____

   c) Your skills in problem solving are the same._____

5. How meaningful was the RVPS model to you as a learning experience?

   a) Very meaningful _____

   b) Meaningful _____

   c) Somewhat meaningful _____

   d) Meaningless _____

6. Do you feel that the RVPS model should be made available to all teachers in their in-service training program? Yes_____ No_____ Am not sure_____

7. Briefly describe how you could adapt three aspects of the Life Plan Program to back home situations. _____

_____

_____

8. Would you recommend the Life Plan Program to another group of teachers? Yes_____ No_____

9. How useful did you find the talk of Dr. Busby?

   a) Very useful _____

   b) Useful _____

   c) Slightly useful _____

   d) Not useful _____

10. How would you rate the degree of success you had in making use of the learning opportunities provided in the triad (three concentric circles) T groups?

   a) A great deal _____

   b) Some _____

   c) Very little _____

11. How could your learning opportunities in the Triad T group be improved?

_____

_____

12. How would you rate your involvement and commitment to your back home plans from this learning experience?

   a) A great deal _____

   b) Some _____

   c) Very little _____

13.a What experience in the "problem solving for back home" helped you the most?

_____

_____

13.b What experience in the "problem solving for back home" helped you the least?

_____

_____

LIFE PLAN PROGRAM OUTLINE

1. Life Line
2. Discuss
3. Ten Descriptions of Self, "Who Am I?"
4. Priority Arrangement
5. Discuss
6. Obit and Epitaph
7. Discuss
8. Who Would I Like to Be?
9. A Day or Two In Your Life Ten Years From Now.
10. Eight (8) Categories -- listed below
11. Formulate Projects To Get To Do Things Well You Want To Do Well

CATEGORIES

1. Peak Experiences (a list of things that matter to you)
2. Things I Do Well
3. Things I Do Poorly
4. Things I Would Like To Stop Doing
5. Things I Would Like To Learn To Do Well
6. Peak Experiences I Would Like To Have
7. Values To Be Realized
8. Things I Would Like To Start Doing Now

QUESTIONS USED AS GUIDELINES FOR INTERVIEWS

NAME: _____

1. How do you feel you have functioned as a teacher in this school year so far as compared to previous years?

2. Have you done anything differently as a teacher in this school year as compared to other years?

3. Do you feel that you have related differently to other teachers in this school year as compared to previous years?

4. Have your activities as related to other teachers been any different during this school year as compared to previous years?

5. Do you feel that you have related differently to your superiors (e.g., principal) during this school year as compared to previous years?

6. Do you think that your role has been different during this school year in school activities that involve you and your superiors (e.g., principal) as compared to previous school years?

7. Do you feel that you have related differently to students during this school year as compared to previous years?

8. Have your activities as related to students been any different during this school year as compared to previous years?

9. Do you feel that you have related differently to your community (e.g., PTA groups, etc.) during this school year as compared to previous years?

10. Have your activities as related to your community (e.g., PTA groups, etc.) been any different during this school year as compared to previous years?

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR SUPERIORS' RATINGS

NAME: _____

1. In your opinion has the above named teacher been functioning differently in any way during this school year as compared to previous years? If so, in what ways? Please mention specific activities.

2. Has the teacher initiated any activities within the school system? Please give details.

3. Has the teacher joined in and supported any new activities that have been started by others in the school? Please give details.

4. How does this teacher relate to other teachers? Please give details.

5. How does the teacher get along with the students? Please give some examples if possible.

6. Is there anything else you can tell us about this teacher which will help us understand his role?